

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 13-18, 20-21, 23, 25, 27, 30 and 39 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 13-14, 18 and 25 are amended and new claim 39 is added. Various amendments may be made for clarity and may be unrelated to issues of patentability.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by Examiner Basehoar during the telephonic interview on July 15 with applicant's representative, Mr. Oren. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 13, 18 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments obviate the grounds for rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 18, 20-21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,272,545 to Flanagan et al. (hereafter Flanagan) in view of U.S. Patent 5,999,937 to Ellard, U.S. Patent 5,392,447 to Schlack et al. (hereafter Schlack) and newly-cited U.S. Patent 7,152,205 to Day. The Office Action also rejects claims 13-17, 25, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Flanagan in view of U.S. Patent 5,392,390 to Crozier, Ellard and Schlack. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites composing data in a first application program of a plurality of application programs embedded in the PDA, the data being of a first format, wherein composing the data includes entering data in an input screen of the PDA associated with the first application program, and selecting a conversion of the entered data from the first format to a second format suitable for a second application program by selecting one of a plurality of icons that are displayed on the input screen of the PDA, wherein each of the icons represents a

Reply to Office Action dated April 21, 2009

corresponding one of the plurality of application programs. Independent claim 1 also recites that in response to selecting one of the icons, providing an information input window in the input screen, for a user to enter data for the second application program, the information input window being displayed on the input screen together with the composed data, and the user entering data into a plurality of data fields of the information input window. Still further, independent claim 1 also recites converting the entered data to the second format of the plurality of application programs using a conversion program provided in the PDA, and storing the converted data in a database associated with the second application program, the database provided in the PDA, wherein each of the plurality of application programs is selectively operated in the PDA, and wherein the first application program, the conversion program and the second application program are initiated and executed on the PDA, the conversion program to convert data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any other of the plurality of application programs.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the applied references do not teach or suggest features relating to converting using a conversion program in a PDA, such as converting entered data from one format into another format for a plurality of application programs embedded in a PDA.

As discussed during the interview, Flanagan discloses file conversion between a mobile device 3A and a desktop computer 4. See col. 11, lines 4-28. This does not suggest all the operations of a PDA as recited in independent claim 1. Ellard also does not relate to a PDA, but rather teaches a data exchange system between a database 22 and a data source 24. In other words, any conversion occurs across a data exchange between the database 22 and the data

Reply to Office Action dated April 21, 2009

source 24. Schlack relates to an electronic organizer that shares relational data on select functions. Schlack does not relate to converting entered data from one format to another using a conversion program provided on a PDA.

The Office Action (on page 7) also states that Flanagan, Ellard and Schlack do not teach that selecting one of a plurality of menus that are displayed on an input screen in order to perform the conversion. The Office Action cites Day's col. 9, line 59-col. 10, line 21 as teaching activation of an icon. However, Day does not teach or suggest selecting a conversion of entered data by selecting one of a plurality of icons that are displayed on a menu screen of a PDA, where each of the icons represents a corresponding one of the plurality of application programs.

The Office Action (on page 6) also relies on Ellard as teaching an information input window. However, Ellard and Day do not teach or suggest in response to selecting one of the icons, providing an information input window and entering data into a plurality of data fields of the information input window. The other applied references do not teach or suggest these features relating to icons, the information input window and/or data fields of the information input window.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Flanagan, Ellard, Schlack and Day do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Crozier does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 13 recites manually entering, in an input screen, first data including a first prescribed identifier and second data including a second prescribed identifier while executing a first one of a plurality of application programs in the PDA, the first prescribed identifier to indicate a second one of the plurality of application programs into which the first

Reply to Office Action dated April 21, 2009

entered data is to be stored, and the second prescribed identifier to indicate a third one of the plurality of application programs into which the second data is to be stored. Independent claim 13 also recites determining whether the first prescribed identifier is present, determining whether the second prescribed identifier is present, determining the second application program from among the plurality of application programs based on the first prescribed identifier using a table that matches prescribed identifiers to corresponding application programs, converting a format of the first entered data from a first format to a second format using a conversion program provided in the PDA, the second format corresponding to a format required by the second application program, determining the third application program from among the plurality of application programs based on the second prescribed identifier using the table that matches prescribed identifiers to corresponding application programs, and converting a format of the second entered data from the first format to a third format using the conversion program provided in the PDA, the third format corresponding to a format required by the third application program. Independent claim 13 also recites storing the converted first data in a first database associated with the second application program and storing the converted second data in a second database associated with the third application program, the first database and the second database provided in the PDA, wherein each of the plurality of application programs is selectively initiated and executed in the PDA, wherein the conversion program to perform the detecting, the selecting, the converting and the storing.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 13. More specifically, the Office Action states that Flanagan does not teach entering the prescribed identifier code indicative of one of the application programs. The Office Action then

Reply to Office Action dated April 21, 2009

cites Crozier as teaching a prescribed identifier code. However, Crozier does not teach or suggest the specific features relating to the first prescribed identifier and second prescribed identifier where the first prescribed identifier indicates a second one of the application programs and the second prescribed identifier indicates a third one of the application programs.

The Office Action also relies on Schlack as teaching manually entering prescribed identifier code into an application program. However, Schlack merely relates to a file tag to identify or cross reference. See col. 9, lines 57-62. Schlack does not teach or suggest the specifically claimed features relating to the first and second prescribed identifiers. Accordingly, the applied references do not teach or suggest manually entering, in an input screen, first data including a first prescribed identifier and second data including a second prescribed identifier where each of the prescribed identifiers corresponds to a different one of application programs in combination with the claimed converting and determining for each of the respective second and third application programs.

For at least these reasons, Flanagan, Crozier, Ellard and Schlack do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 13. The other applied reference does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 13. Independent claim 13 therefore defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 18 recites entering data by a user while executing a first one of a plurality of application programs embedded in the PDA, each of the plurality of application programs having mutually different data formats, wherein the first application program is a document editing program, and displaying a plurality of icons while executing the first one of the application programs, wherein each of the icons corresponds to a different one of the plurality

Reply to Office Action dated April 21, 2009

of application programs. Independent claim 18 also recites selecting one of the displayed plurality of icons in order to select a second application program in which to store the entered data, and converting the entered data by the user in the document editing program to a second format used by the second application program using a conversion program provided in the PDA, the second application program comprising one of a contact manager, an appointment scheduler, a telephone number organizer or a task list. Independent claim 18 also recites that converting the entered data comprises: providing an information input window having a plurality of data fields for entering format-matched data for the second application program, the information input window being displayed on an input screen together with the data composed in the first application program, and assigning data entered through the data fields of the information input window to corresponding data fields of the second application program.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 18. More specifically, Flanagan, Ellard, Crozier and Schlack do not teach or suggest displaying a plurality of icons while executing the first one of the application programs, wherein each of the icons corresponds to a different one of the plurality of application programs in response to a selection of one of the displayed icons, and selecting one of the displayed plurality of icons in order to select a second application program in which to store the entered data.

Flanagan, Ellard, Crozier and Schlack do not teach or suggest providing an information input window having a plurality of data fields for entering format-matched data for the second application program, the information input window being displayed on an input screen together with the data composed in the first application program in response to a selection of one of the

Reply to Office Action dated April 21, 2009

displayed icons, and assigning data entered through the data fields of the information input window to corresponding data fields of the second application program.

For at least these reasons, Flanagan, Ellard, Crozier and Schlack do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 18. Thus, independent claim 18 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 25 recites an input/output interface of the PDA, configured to receive commands from a user and to display information, the input/output interface to enter data associated with a first application program based on inputs of a user, the entered data including an identification marker to identify a second application program. Independent claim 25 also recites a central processing unit (CPU) of the PDA, and a memory of the PDA, configured to accommodate a plurality of databases associated with a plurality of application programs, the plurality of databases provided in the PDA. Independent claim 25 also recites that a first application program stored on the PDA is configured to receive and store data in a first database using a first data format, a second application program stored on the PDA is configured to receive and store data in a second database using a second data format, the second data format selected based on the identification marker that identifies the second application program. Still further, independent claim 25 also recites that the conversion program performs manual conversion of data by generating an information input window having a plurality of data fields within the first application program for inputting data in a plurality of prescribed fields of the second application program, wherein each of the data fields of the information input window corresponds to a different one of the prescribed fields of the second application program.

Reply to Office Action dated April 21, 2009

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 25. More specifically, Flanagan, Ellard, Schlack and Crozier do not teach or suggest that the conversion program performs manual conversion of data by generating an information input window having a plurality of data fields within the first application program for inputting data in a plurality of prescribed fields of the second application program, wherein each of the data fields of the information input window corresponds to a different one of the prescribed fields of the second application program.. Thus, independent claim 25 defines patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 13, 18 and 25 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.



Reply to Office Action dated April 21, 2009

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 13-18, 20-21, 23, 25, 27 and 30 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694  
Samuel W. Ntiros  
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah (SWN/krf)

**Date: July 21, 2009**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**

\\Fk4\Documents\2031\2031-005\201846.doc